

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed on April 20, 2006. Claims 1-9 and 15-18 are currently pending, of which, Claims 1 and 15 are in independent form. Claims 10-14 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the present application, as presently presented, is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0050518 issued to Roustaei. It is submitted that independent Claim 1, as amended in response to the previous Office Action, is allowable over Roustaei. Accordingly, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Roustaei does not teach or suggest the recitations added to independent Claim 1 in response to the previous Office Action. Specifically, Roustaei does not disclose or suggest "A monolithic circuit chip having a radio frequency (RF) communication capability, wherein the circuit chip comprises: a complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) imager; CMOS microprocessing circuits for receiving image data from the CMOS imager and data from an RF receiver; an RFID reader; and a memory for providing non volatile data storage on the circuit chip," as recited by Applicants' Claim 1. Support for the underlined recitations to Applicants' Claim 1 can be found at page 11, lines 22-25 of Applicants' specification.

Roustaei discloses RFID technology at paragraph 0168 in conjunction with FIG. 22 where an RFID tag for identifying an item within the field of a RF reader is described. Roustaei, however, does not disclose or suggest a monolithic circuit chip having radio frequency (RF)

communication capability and comprising, inter alia, an RFID reader, as recited by Applicants' Claim 1.

FIG. 22 of Roustaei illustrates an RFID tag 2220 (not an RFID reader) which according to paragraph 0168 of Roustaei can be deactivated by a device 2210 creating an electromagnetic field in front of an imager 100. An article having the deactivated RFID tag 2220 can then freely pass from the store (usually, store doors are equipped with readers allowing the detection of a non-deactivated tag). The RFID tag 2220 is a conventional RFID tag affixed to articles for applications such as Electronic Article Surveillance ("EAS"). There is no disclosure or suggestion by Roustaei of a monolithic circuit having radio frequency (RF) communication capability and comprising an RFID reader as recited by Applicants' Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is allowable over Roustaei. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from Claim 1 and contain all of the features of Claim 1, therefore for the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are also patentable. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) and allowance of Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0034222 issued to Roustaei et al. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 and contain all of the features of Claim 1, therefore for the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 4 is also patentable.

Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of Claim 4 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei. Claims 7-9 depend from Claim 1 and contain all of the features of Claim 1, therefore for the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7-9 are also patentable. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of Claims 7-9 are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Roustaei does not disclose or suggest "A method for communicating image information using a monolithic circuit chip comprising the steps of: capturing, by a digital imager, an image; processing the image by a processor using a ferroelectric memory; equipping the monolithic circuit chip with an RFID reader for reading an RFID tag; and transmitting, by a radio frequency transmitter, the processed image over an air-interface, wherein the digital imager, processor and radio frequency transmitter are formed on the monolithic circuit chip," as recited by Applicants' Claim 15. Support for the underlined recitations to Applicants' Claim 15 can be found at page 11, lines 22-25 of Applicants' specification.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Roustaei discloses RFID technology at paragraph 0168 in conjunction with FIG. 22 where an RFID tag for identifying an item within the field of a RF reader is described. Roustaei, however, does not disclose or suggest a method for communicating image formation using a monolithic circuit chip comprising at least the step of

equipping the monolithic circuit chip with an RFID reader for reading an RFID tag, as recited by Applicants' Claim 15.

Accordingly, it is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 15 is allowable over Roustaci. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of Claim 15 are respectfully requested.


Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaci in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,029 issued to Tomer. Claims 16-18 depend from Claim 15 and contain all of the features of Claim 15, therefore for the reasons presented above for the patentability of Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 16-18 are also patentable. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of Claims 16-18 are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview may facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number indicated below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of Claims 1-9 and 15-18 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


George Likourezos
Reg. No. 40,067
Attorney for Applicants

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP
445 Broad Hollow Road
Suite 225
Melville, New York 11747
631-501-5706
FAX: 631-501-3526